

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	T				
APPLICATION NO.	O. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,986	05/16/2005		Makoto Fujii	272482US0PCT	1900
22850	7590	11/03/2006		EXAM	NER
C. IRVIN M	CCLELI	LAND	MERCIER, MELISSA S		
OBLON, SPI	VAK, MC	CLELLAND, MA			
1940 DÚKE S	•	,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDR	IA, VA	22314	1615		

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,986	FUJII ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melissa S. Mercier	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communi	ication appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states are reply within the set or extended period for reply. Any reply received by the Office later than three months a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re nunication. atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) file 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practice.	2b)⊠ This action is non-final. for allowance except for formal matt	• •
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restrict Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	re withdrawn from consideration. stion and/or election requirement. e Examiner. a) accepted or b) objected to	•
Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including 11) The oath or declaration is objected to	the correction is required if the drawing	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim of a laim of a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority of the priority of the certified copies of the	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
		•
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P' 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5-16-05 8-9-05.	TO-948) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

Claims 1-3 and 6 are pending in this application. Applicant has canceled claims 4-5. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected.

Priority

Applicants claim of Priority to PCT/JP03/14249 filed on November 10, 2003 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

Receipt of Applicants Information Disclosure Statements filed on May 16, 2005 and August 9, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1615

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1-3 and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiroyama (EP 1 153 595 A2).

Shiroyama teaches a "clear aqueous composition comprising a ceramide, a long chain fatty acid having 12-24 carbon atoms, a nonionic surfactant, and water. The composition is useful for cosmetics" (abstract). Isostearic acid is disclosed as a suitable long chain fatty acid. Shiroyama further teaches the addition of a sterol compound. (paragraph 0013).

Regarding Claim 2, polyoxyethylene hydrogenated castor oil is disclosed as the nonionic surfactant (paragraph 0013).

Regarding Claim 3, Shiroyama discloses, the weight ratios of ceramide to the long chain fatty acid is 20:1 to 1:3, while the reference does not teach a sterol and fatty acid combined within the weight ratios, it would be within the knowledge of a person of

ordinary skill in this art to expand upon the teachings of Shiroyama in order to produce a product with the desired properties. Shiroyama teaches the effects of adding too much ceramide (not economical and does not improve stability), too much fatty acid component (stability of the system deteriorates). Applicant would have the ability to modify the amounts of each component to yield a suitable product through routine experimentation with the teachings of Shiroyama.

Regarding Claim 6, Shiroyama does not specifically disclose the use of polyoxyethylene (60) hydrogenated castor oil, however, he does disclose suitable nonionic surfactants can include polyoxyethylene hydrogenated castor oil derivatives. It would be within the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art to choose a derivative that would give the qualities, properties and results desired.

Shiroyama does not disclose a mean particle diameter for the emulsion.

However, it would have been within the knowledge of the person of ordinary skill in this art to adjust and set the desired particle size in order to make an emulsion, which would meet their desired qualities and properties.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have expanded upon the teachings of Shiroyama in order to create a semitransparent cosmetic composition which is excellent in clearness and feel of use, because Shiroyama's preferred embodiment discloses, a clear aqueous ceramide composition comprising a lipid composition comprising a ceramide, isostearic acid, at least one polyoxyethylene hydrogenated castor oil, water, a sterol and a polyhydric alcohol. It is noted that applicant utilizes the terminology "comprising" in claim

Application/Control Number: 10/534,986 Page 5

Art Unit: 1615

1, which would allow for the inclusion of additional components, such as the polyhydric alcohol (paragraph 0038).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa S. Mercier whose telephone number is (571) 272-9039. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4pm Mon through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSMercier

MICHAEL P. WOODWARD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600